

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification, FIGS. 3B, 4, and 5, and claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-15, and 17-22 have been amended, and new claim 23 has been added. Claims 1-15 and 17-23 are pending, with claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22 being independent. No new matter is presented in this Amendment Accompanying Request for Continued Examination.

Entry of Amendment After Final Rejection

Please enter the Amendment After Final Rejection of January 25, 2010.

Drawing Amendments

FIG. 3B has been amended to change "RECORD TO" to "PLAY FROM" in the two circles to be consistent with "PLAY" in the box.

FIG. 4 has been amended to change "PRIORITES" TO "PRIORITIES" in boxes 42 and 43 to correct spelling errors.

FIG. 5 has been amended to change "PRIORITES" TO "PRIORITIES" in boxes 53 and 54 to correct spelling errors, and to change "INFORMATION CHANGED PRIORITIES" to "INFORMATION REGARDING CHANGED PRIORITIES" in box 54 to be consistent with box 53.

It is respectfully requested that the Office indicate in the next Office Action that the three replacement sheets of drawings attached hereto have been accepted.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 112

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office states that there is no antecedent basis for "the priorities" in claim 14, line 1. Accordingly, claim 14 was amended in the Amendment After Final Rejection of January 25, 2010, to delete "the" from this phrase to eliminate the lack of antecedent basis problem as discussed on page 7 of the Amendment After Final Rejection of January 25, 2010.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-15 and 17-22 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson et al. (Nelson) (U.S. Patent No. 7,170,422). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22

Independent claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22 all recite changing priorities of task-handlers of a hybrid device. However, the terms "priority", "priorities," "task", "task-handler(s)", "task handler(s)", and "hybrid" do not appear in Nelson, and the only appearance of any form of the word "handle" is in the phrase "[o]ne way to handle" in column 7, line 55, of Nelson. Furthermore, the Office has not identified the elements in Nelson that it considers to correspond to the "priorities", the "task-handlers", and the "hybrid device" recited in claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22 and claims 2-4, 6-13, 15, and 17-20 depending directly or indirectly from claims 1, 5, and 14.

The above arguments were also presented on page 8 of the Amendment After Final Rejection of January 25, 2010. However, the Office did not take note of these arguments and answer the substance of them in the Advisory Action of February 17, 2010, as required by MPEP 707.07(f).

Also, the Office has not identified the element(s) in Nelson that it considers to correspond to the "input unit" recited in claims 1 and 5 and to the "input device" recited in claim 14, such the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to claims 1, 5, and 14 and claims 2-4, 6-13, 15, and 17-20 depending directly or indirectly therefrom.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Office identify the elements in Nelson that it considers to correspond to the "priorities", the "task-handlers", and the "hybrid device" recited in claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22, the "input unit" recited in claims 1 and 5, and the "input device" recited in claim 14 should the Office continue to rely on Nelson in the next Office Action.

It is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest the following features of independent claim 1 as it was considered in the Final Office Action of November 25, 2009:

1. A user interface method of a hybrid device having an input unit and a plurality of task-handlers controlled by the operation of a function key of the input unit, the user interface method comprising:
 - receiving information to change priorities of the task-handlers, using the hybrid device;
 - changing the priorities of the task-handlers in the hybrid device, based on the received information; and
 - storing information regarding the changed priorities in the hybrid device, according to a predetermined application type;wherein the priorities of the task-handlers of the hybrid device relate to an order in which the task-handlers are individually and selectively controlled, by the operation of the function key.

Nelson discloses a programmable universal remote control that can be programmed to control various devices such as a TV, a DVD player, and lights as shown in FIG. 4 of Nelson. However, it is submitted that none of the programmable universal remote control, the TV, the DVD player, and the lights are a "hybrid device" as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the Office has not explained which element in Nelson it considers to correspond to the "hybrid device" in claim 1, or why it considers that element to correspond to the "hybrid device" in claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest a "hybrid device" as recited in claim 1.

FIG. 8 of Nelson shows command sequences in boxes 228A-228F that correspond to user-defined states 226A-226F such as "POWER OFF", "WATCH TV", etc., that are defined by a user using Nelson's programmable universal remote control and stored in the programmable universal remote control for later use. Each of the command sequences can be accessed from the box 240 in the active display 24 in FIG. 10 of Nelson, and can optionally be converted to a button on the screen of the active display or assigned to one of the function keys 28 in FIG. 1 of Nelson as described in column 12, lines 33-38, of Nelson.

The Office apparently considers Nelson's command sequence, or the button on the screen to which it is assigned, or the function key 28 to which it is assigned, to correspond to the "function key" recited in claim 1, and apparently considers the commands in the command sequence, such as the commands "TV ON", "DVD OFF", "LIGHTS DIM", "TV CHANNEL 002",

"TV FORMAT STANDARD 16:9", and "TV INPUT 2" in the command sequence 228C identified by "FOX" in FIG. 8 of Nelson and shown in box 240 in FIG. 10 of Nelson to correspond to "a plurality of task-handlers controlled by the operation of a function key" as recited in claim 1 as it was considered in the Final Office Action of November 25, 2009.

However it is submitted that the commands in Nelson's command sequence are not "task-handlers" as recited in claim 1, but are commands that, for the purposes of this discussion, may be considered to be processed by task-handlers in Nelson's devices, i.e., the TV, the DVD player, and the lights shown in FIG. 4 of Nelson, although Nelson does not actually disclose that these devices have such task-handlers. For example, the command "TV ON" in the command sequence 228C in FIG. 8 of Nelson may be considered to be processed by a "TV ON" task-handler in the TV in FIG. 4, the command "DVD PLAYER OFF" in the command sequence 228C may be considered to be processed by a "DVD PLAYER OFF" task-handler in the DVD player in FIG. 4, etc. Accordingly, it is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest "a plurality of task-handlers controlled by the operation of a function key" as recited in claim 1 as it was considered in the Final Office Action of November 25, 2009.

Since Nelson's programmable universal remote control enables the user to specify the order in which the commands are listed in the command sequences 228A-228F in FIG. 8 of Nelson, the Office apparently considers this to correspond to "changing the priorities of the task-handlers in the hybrid device, based on the received information" recited in claim 1. However, as discussed above, any task-handlers that may be present in Nelson's system would be in the devices that are controlled by the programmable universal remote control using the commands in the command sequences, such as the TV, the DVD player, and the lights in FIG. 4 of Nelson, none of which is a "hybrid device" as recited in claim 1, rather than in the programmable universal remote control itself, which is also not a "hybrid device" as recited in claim 1. Nelson's programmable universal remote control cannot change the priorities of any task-handlers that may be present in the devices in FIG. 4 that are controlled by programmable universal remote control. Accordingly, it is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest "changing the priorities of the task-handlers in the hybrid device, based on the received information" as recited in claim 1.

Since Nelson's programmable universal remote control apparently stores the command sequences with the commands in the order selected by the user in the onboard computer

memory 112 in FIG. 3 of Nelson, the Office apparently considers this to correspond to "storing information regarding the changed priorities in the hybrid device, according to a predetermined application type" as recited in claim 1. However, as discussed above, the Nelson's programmable universal remote control is not a "hybrid device" as recited in claim 1, and cannot change the priorities of any task-handlers that may be present in the devices in FIG. 4 of Nelson that are controlled by programmable universal remote control, none of which is a "hybrid device" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest "storing information regarding the changed priorities in the hybrid device, according to a predetermined application type" as recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 5, 14, 21, and 22 recite features that are similar to the features of claim 1 discussed above, and it is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest these features of claims 5, 14, 21, and 22 for at least the same reasons discussed above that Nelson does not disclose or suggest the similar features of claim 1.

The above arguments were also presented on pages 8-10 of the Amendment After Final Rejection of January 25, 2010. In response to these arguments, the Office states as follows in the Advisory Action of February 17, 2010:

As to claim 1, applicant argues that Nelson fails to teach "hybrid device" and "task handlers" and also fails to teach changing priorities and storing the changed priorities according to the predetermined application type. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. The claimed invention does not disclose what is defined by "hybrid device" and "task-handlers". Applicant argues none of the devices in Nelson is a hybrid device without showing the difference or claiming what constitutes to be a hybrid device and how is the claimed hybrid device different than the universal remote control or other multimedia devices of Nelson. Applicant also fails to show if the hybrid device and the user interface are two different devices or one device. Examiner fails to see the difference between the claimed task-handlers and the commands in Nelson as the execution of the commands performs the tasks and considered to be the task handler. Nelson also teaches that the remote control unit can store the command sequences as a function key based on used [sic] input and the user can modify, create or change the sequence of the commands as desired(changing [sic] priorities) (col 7, lines 13-47) as claimed.

However, it is submitted that is the Office's burden to show that Nelson discloses "priorities", a "hybrid device", and "task-handlers" as recited in claim 1, and it is submitted that

the Office has not met this burden because it has not identified the elements in Nelson that it considers to correspond to the "priorities", the "task-handlers", and the "hybrid device" recited in claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22 and claims 2-4, 6-13, 15, and 17-20 depending directly or indirectly from claims 1, 5, and 14.

Furthermore, claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22 have been amended to more clearly define aspects of the invention, particularly with respect to the "hybrid device" and the "task-handlers." For example, claim 1 now recites the following features, and claims 5, 14, 21, and 22 recite similar features:

1. A user interface method of a hybrid device, the hybrid device comprising a plurality of task-handlers corresponding to a common function key of an input unit, the task-handlers being controlled by operation of the common function key of the input unit, the user interface method comprising:
 - receiving information to change priorities of the task-handlers, using the hybrid device;
 - changing the priorities of the task-handlers in the hybrid device, based on the received information; and
 - storing information regarding the changed priorities in the hybrid device, according to a predetermined application type indicating how the changed priorities are to be applied;wherein:
 - the hybrid device has a capability of simultaneously performing a plurality of recording and/or reproducing functions by simultaneously recording data to and/or reproducing data from at least one information storage medium;
 - each of the task-handlers of the hybrid device controlled by the operation of the common function key controls a different one of the plurality of recording and/or reproducing functions of the hybrid device; and
 - the priorities of the task-handlers of the hybrid device relate to an order in which the task-handlers are individually and selectively controlled by the operation of the common function key.

It is submitted that the changes to claims 1, 5, 14, 21, and 22 are supported at least by paragraphs [0003]-[0005], [0029], and [0032] of the specification.

It is submitted that neither Nelson's programmable universal remote control nor any of the devices that are controlled by Nelson's programmable universal remote control is "[a] hybrid device comprising a plurality of task-handlers corresponding to a common function key of an input unit, the task-handlers being controlled by operation of the common function key of the input unit," that "has a capability of simultaneously performing a plurality of recording and/or reproducing functions by simultaneously recording data to and/or reproducing data from at least one information storage medium," wherein "each of the task-handlers of the hybrid device controlled by the operation of the common function key controls a different one of the plurality of recording and/or reproducing functions of the hybrid device" as now recited in claim 1, or in similar form in claims 5, 14, 21, and 22.

Claim 6

It is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest the following features of dependent claim 6:

wherein, in response to a request to change the priorities, the display unit displays a menu to select the . . . function key from a plurality of function keys, a menu to change priorities for the selected . . . function key, a priority change result, and a menu to select the application type.

In the Final Office Action of November 25, 2010, the Office states that FIG. 10 and column 4, lines 1-47, of Nelson disclose these features of claim 6. However, it is not seen where these portions of Nelson disclose or suggest the three menus and the priority change result recited in claim 6, and the Office has not identified the elements in these portions of Nelson that it considers to correspond to these elements of claim 6, such that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to these features of claim 6.

The above arguments were also presented on page 11 of the Amendment After Final Rejection of January 25, 2010. In response to these arguments, the Office states as follows in the Advisory Action of February 17, 2010:

As to claim 6, applicant argues that the claimed three menus and the priority change results are not identified in Nelson. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. Nelson teaches a display unit that displays the function key from the plurality of the function key [sic] (figure 10, element 240, function key menu) where each

of the function key [sic] has a sequence of task-handlers (figure 8, priority change result) that performed [sic] in sequence and can be modified, changed and updated (col 7, lines 13-47, changes are done from the stored sequences menus as shown in figure 8) and a menu of the selected application type (figure 10, element 36).

However, element 240 in FIG. 10 of Nelson is list of command sequences, which are sequences of commands or functions as can be seen from FIG. 8 of Nelson, rather than "a menu to select the . . . function key from a plurality of function keys" as recited in claim 6. In FIG. 10 of Nelson, the function keys are "VOL", "CHA", "LIGHTS", "DVD ON/OFF", "TV ON/OFF", "PLAY", "STOP/EJECT", "SEARCH" "NEXT", "RECORD" "WATCH", and "INFO", and it is not seen where FIG. 10 or any other figure of Nelson shows "a menu to select the . . . function key from a plurality of function keys" as recited in claim 6.

Furthermore, assuming *arguendo* that column 7, lines 13-47, of Nelson discloses that the command sequences shown in FIG. 8 can be "modified, changed and updated" as alleged by the Office, the Office still has not pointed out where "a menu to change priorities for the selected . . . function key" as recited in claim 6 is shown in the drawings of Nelson or is disclosed in the specification of Nelson.

Furthermore, FIG. 8 of Nelson merely shows different command sequences. It does not show a result of changing the priority of the commands within the different command sequences. Accordingly, it is submitted that FIG. 8 of Nelson does not show a priority change result" as recited in claim 6 as alleged by the Office.

Furthermore, although the Office considers element 36 in FIG. 10 of Nelson to be "a menu to select the application type" as recited in claim 6, element 36 is actually a list of locations, such as a family room and a bedroom, and it is not seen how this list of locations can reasonably be considered to be "a menu to select the application type" as recited in claim 6. Furthermore, claim 1 from which claim 6 depends now recites "a predetermined application type indicating how the changed priorities are to be applied," and it is not seen how the list of locations in element 36 can reasonably be considered to be "a menu to select the application type indicating how the changed priorities are to be applied" now recited in claim 6 by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

Conclusion—Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-15 and 17-22 (i.e., claims 1, 5, 6, 14, 21, and 22 discussed above and claims 2-4, 7-13, 15, and 17-20 depending directly or indirectly from claims 1, 5, 6, and 14) under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson be withdrawn.

Patentability of New Claim 23

It is submitted that Nelson does not disclose or suggest the following features of new dependent claim 23:

wherein the input unit is a front panel of the hybrid device or a remote controller of the hybrid device; and

the task-handlers are not part of the input unit.

It is submitted that these features are supported at least by paragraph [0030] of the specification.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that new claim 23 is patentable over Nelson, and an indication to that effect is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Office is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 25, 2010

By: /Randall S. Svihla/
Randall S. Svihla
Registration No. 56,273

NSIP Law
1156 15th Street NW, Suite 603
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 429-0020
Fax: (202) 315-3758
CYP/RSS

Attachments